



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Adress: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/755,143	01/08/2004	Yung Yip	10426US01	9649
7590 Attention: Eric D. Levinson Imation Corp Legal Affairs P.O. Box 64898 St. Paul, MN 55164-0898		10/01/2008	EXAMINER CASTRO, ANGEL A	
			ART UNIT 2627	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/01/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/755,143	Applicant(s) YIP, YUNG
	Examiner Angel A. Castro	Art Unit 2627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2008.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1.3-10.12 and 21-24 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 21 and 22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1, 3-10, 12, 23-24 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/2/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-8, 12, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaaden et al (U.S. Pat. 5,917,671) in view of Nagata et al (U.S. Pat. 5,027,245).

Regarding claim 1, Kaaden et al discloses a system for reading and writing information to magnetic media (figures 1-4) comprising:

a planar array of write heads 3, arranged in a two-dimensional matrix, wherein each of the write heads defines a write channel for the system as the magnetic media moves in a direction of motion relative to the planar array of write heads; and wherein each of the write

heads includes an excitation coil that coils in a direction perpendicular to a plane defined by the planar array of write heads; and

 a linear array of read heads 7, wherein each of the heads defines a read channel for the system, and wherein each of the write heads in the two dimensional matrix corresponds to one of the read heads of the linear array of read heads such that each of the write channels corresponds to one of the read channels as the magnetic media moves in the direction of motion.

Regarding claim 3, Kaaden et al discloses that each of the write heads is substantially aligned with a corresponding one of the read heads such that each of the write channels substantially aligns with a corresponding one of the read channels (see figure 1).

Regarding claim 8, Kaaden et al discloses that a number of write heads in the array of write heads is the same as a number of read heads in array of read heads.

Regarding claim 12, Kaaden et al discloses an additional head that functions as a read element that reads pre-written servo marks (column 1, lines 50-51).

Regarding claim 23, it is inherent in the reference to Kaaden et al that one or more of the write heads also functions as a read head element that reads pre-written servo marks.

Regarding claims 1, 3-8, 12 and 23, Kaaden et al discloses the system described above. Kaaden differs in not: (A) utilizing GMR type read head, (B) specifying the listed track spacing (re claims 4-6).

Concerning (A), it is very well known and common to utilize GMR type heads for reading. Nagata et al shows this in the environment of a plural track system with separate read and write heads.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize GMR type heads for the read heads in Schwarz. The motivation is as follows: these are commonly used for read heads.

Concerning (B), it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the system of Schwarz to have the listed spacing. The motivation is as follows: this would have been the obvious result of routine experimentation and optimization.

4. Claims 9-10 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaaden et al in view of Nagata et al and further in view of Nozieres et al.

Regarding claims 9-10 and 24, Schwarz does not specify the listed controller details. Nozieres et al teaches individually controlling each write head in a plural head environment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teaching of Nozieres et al to Kaaden et al in view of Nagata et al. The motivation is as follows: one of ordinary skill in the art uses any known control scheme.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-10, 12, and 23-24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Angel A. Castro whose telephone number is 571-272-7584. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8 AM to 6 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrea Wellington can be reached on 571-272-4483. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Angel A Castro/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2627